

Scriber Creek Advisory Committee Meeting Summary

May 19, 2014, 5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.
19200 44th Avenue West, Lynnwood, WA 98046
Lynnwood Library

Action Items

| | Action Items | Person Responsible |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 1. | Committee members will fill-in the evaluation criteria matrix and return the completed matrix to Shanese Crosby by June 5th . | Committee members |
| 2. | Add an “Alternatives Considered” section in the Recommendations Memorandum Template. | Triangle |
| 3. | Present Committee members a photo of the half-collapsed culvert just upstream of the study area. | City of Lynnwood |

Welcome/Introductions

The purpose of this meeting was to brainstorm and discuss potential flood reduction alternatives.

Attendees

| Advisory Committee | Project Team |
|---|--|
| Josh Brower , Representing Great Floors Owner Ed dos Remedios , Citizen Dave Gilbertson , Parks Board Larry Ingraham , Citizen David Plodwick , Citizen Roz Smith , Casa Del Rey Eric Whitehead , Casa Del Rey | Robert Victor , City of Lynnwood Project Manager Jared Bond , City of Lynnwood Mark Ewbank , Herrera, Consultant Project Manager Mike Giseburt , Leidos Cynthia Carlstad , Triangle Shanese Crosby , Triangle |

General Business

There were no comments on the April meeting summary. Committee members can send any suggested comments to Shanese Crosby (Triangle Associates). The March meeting summary is now available online, with addresses removed.

Development of Alternatives

Advisory Committee members brainstormed potential alternatives for the project team to evaluate in Phase 2 of the Scriber Creek Flood Reduction Study.

| | Potential <u>Avoidance Strategies</u> to be Evaluated | Potential Co-Benefits | Discussion | Early Action? |
|----|---|---|---|---------------|
| 1. | Sediment Removal at problem areas (such as Casa Del Rey and others); could include volunteer | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational benefits – this is an opportunity to get community | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sediment removal as part of a holistic plan | ✓ |

| | Potential <u>Avoidance Strategies</u> to be Evaluated | Potential Co-Benefits | Discussion | Early Action? |
|----|--|--|--|----------------------|
| | participation. | members out in the stream and teach them about the stream. | may be more permissible. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regulators may be more amenable if removal is done by hand instead of by heavy equipment. | |
| 2. | Use modeling to evaluate flood prone properties at a specified level of service (e.g. 25-year level of service). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Model where these properties are both with the existing culverts and if the culverts were replaced Consider buy outs of flood prone properties Incorporate distributed detention/ storage ponds where possible, such as locating small storage ponds on the properties that may be bought out, or other available properties such as the school district open area (also described as a separate measure below). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental benefits – potentially more open space. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would help flooding throughout the corridor. Could use a similar financing framework as a utility project. | |
| 3. | Flood proofing – elevate structures so they are not damaged by flood waters. | | | |
| 4. | Zoning Review – Identify undeveloped areas and see where building may occur. Are setbacks adequate? | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is little undeveloped land in the study corridor. | |
| 5. | Incentives for stormwater retrofits – Incentives for landowners to retrofit to retain stormwater on-site. Could reduce surface water utility rates as an incentive. | | | |

| | Potential <u>Structural Strategies to be Evaluated</u> | Potential Co-Benefits | Discussion | Early Action? |
|----|---|---|--|---------------|
| 1. | Raising Roads – raise road at 188 th and possibly excavate upland areas around the wetland to create more storage. Do not upsize the culvert, thus creating a sort of taller dam to impound more water in the upstream wetland. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership Opportunities – potential to partner with Parks Department | | |
| 2. | Raising Roads – raise portions of old 196 th and driveway access of Park View Plaza and Great Floors. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership Opportunities – potential to partner with private businesses and the Parks Department. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to consider upstream impact of this project if culverts are not enlarged. • Would not necessarily have to deal with permits since there would be no in-water work. | |
| 3. | Regional Storage Site at Edmonds School District Property. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational benefits – could include educational programs at the site. • Partnership Opportunities – potential to partner with the Parks Department. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would likely provide relief to Casa Del Rey. • Because of the buffer zone requirements, there is little the School District can do with the land. • Could additionally excavate the site for more storage and keep the setback the same. | |
| 4. | Regional Storage Site at empty lot south of 188 th on 55 th Ave. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no wetlands on this property. | |
| 5. | Increase creek channel size – where possible, potentially near 188 th . | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not solve the problem, and it will be difficult to get community buy-in as private businesses may have to give up parking spaces under this alternative. | |

| | Potential <u>Structural Strategies to be Evaluated</u> | Potential Co-Benefits | Discussion | Early Action? |
|-----|--|---|---|---------------|
| 6. | Levees/berms at north end of project site – near Eunia Plaza/Flynn’s Carpet | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation benefit – levees and berms can have walking/bike trails on top of them. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be a cost-effective, short-term solution. | |
| 7. | Earthen Levees or HESCO barriers – spot solutions. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheap to deploy. • Not aesthetically pleasing. • Will not contribute to an increase in sediment deposition. | |
| 8. | Diversion pipes or channels. To convey high flows so existing creek channel does not overtop its banks. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common technique, but may be difficult to implement in this corridor. | |
| 9. | Culvert Realignment – realign culvert beneath Casa Del Rey access roadway. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership Opportunities – potential to partner with private residents. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have to consider downstream effects. • Could resolve more than one issue. | |
| 10. | Culvert Replacements – replace culverts under 196 th . | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Log fill beneath 196th roadway could pose significant construction challenges and increase costs. | |
| 11. | Scriber Lake Outlet Control – increase storage, re-do inlet control. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational benefits – could include educational programs at the site. • Partnership Opportunities – potential to partner with the Parks Department. | | |
| 12. | Sediment Deposition Ponds. | | | |
| 13. | Channel Stabilization – to control erosion. | | | |

| | Potential <u>Watershed-wide Projects to be Evaluated</u> | Potential Co-Benefits | Discussion | Early Action? |
|----|--|-----------------------|---|---------------|
| 1. | Enlarge Scriber Lake by removing hill between Scriber Lake and smaller body of water. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can add a walking path(s) around the lake; park improvements. | |

| | Potential Watershed-wide Projects to be Evaluated | Potential Co-Benefits | Discussion | Early Action? |
|----|---|--|--|---------------|
| 2. | Address tributary inflows to the creek. This could be stormwater retrofits to reduce inflows to Scriber Creek. | | | |
| 3. | Water reuse through stormwater retrofit incentives for businesses. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incentivize businesses to retain their water like PCC in Edmonds. Tax incentives for stormwater retrofits. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely cannot change the tax structure as a result of this Study. | |
| 4. | Underground storage vaults – possibly at School District site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can reduce public safety concerns surrounding above-ground detention facilities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public safety | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This solution is usually only possible if there a large lot available. | |
| 5. | Stormwater pump stations – could potentially increase storage in Scriber Lake and have a short pump station under 196 th . | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very expensive. Could have negative downstream effects. | |
| 6. | Increase storm drain pipe sizes to enable in-pipe flow control when completing future road projects to support corridor flood management. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complex and time consuming; could take decades to fully implement. | |

Questions & Answers

During the alternatives development brainstorm, Committee members asked the following questions. City answers are in *italics*.

- In general, how long does it take to secure a permit?
 - It depends on what the permit is for. At a minimum, projects of these types require the City to go through the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) process and coordinate with multiple permitting agencies. The State Department of Fish and Wildlife has 30 days to make a decision after the SEPA process is complete.*
 - For smaller maintenance type projects, like the removal of sediment at specific problem areas, a permit could possibly be achieved within a year, but it is not common.*
- Is the City pursuing grant funding for these projects?
 - Yes, the City is actively seeking grants.*
- How much does the City spend on flood recovery when it does flood? Can that funding be reallocated for flood reduction projects?

- *The details of this budget are not known to the project team at this time. The City has set aside some seed funding for project implementation. Phase 2 of the Scriber Creek Flood Reduction Study will include the identification of outside funding sources.*
- Are culverts more prone to fill with sediment than open channels?
 - *Not necessarily, it depends on flow velocities and adjacent channel characteristics.*
- Does the City have a culvert maintenance program?
 - *Yes, but it depends on the regulatory cycle. The City usually receives a permit to complete ongoing maintenance work on a 5-year timeline.*

Next Steps

The final Advisory Committee meeting will be held on June 16, 2014 from 5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

Before the next meeting, Committee members will fill out the “community considerations” criterion for the alternatives brainstormed at the May 19th meeting. Triangle will compile the members’ analysis and add this information to the Recommendations Memorandum for Committee members’ consideration at the June meeting.

Attachment 1 – Flood Reduction Categories Worksheet

This document provides common categories of flood reduction alternatives for the Scriber Creek Flood Reduction Advisory Committee to consider as it brainstorms potential solutions to address long-term flooding in the Scriber Creek corridor. The City of Lynnwood is interested in hearing creative, innovative solutions from Committee members, in addition to the more common types of flood reduction projects.

Avoidance

Avoidance includes projects that help ensure areas at risk of flooding are not developed, unless development can occur without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Examples include:

- Zoning laws / critical area designations / setbacks
- Acquisition of flood-prone property
- **Discussion Question:** What do you see as the most important action the City can take to avoid flooding impacts?

Structural

Structural measures to reduce flooding impacts encompass solutions that are constructed, such as:

- Stormwater storage ponds (Edmonds School District stormwater pond)
- Creek flow storage (such as the North Scriber Creek Detention Facility north of 172nd & west of SR 99)
- Levees and berms
- Diversion channels or pipes (for high flows)
- Culvert replacements (for greater flow capacity)
- Channel enlargement and/or realignment
- Outlet control on Scriber Lake
- Pumping
- **Discussion Question:** What do you want to see the City construct to help alleviate flooding?

Watershed Scale Projects

Watershed scale projects occur at the watershed level, meaning the solutions are not site specific.

Examples include:

- Distributed stormwater storage/detention to reduce storm flows to the creek
- Low impact development stormwater standards to reduce storm flows that leave developed sites, including homes
- **Discussion Question:** What do you want to see the City implement at the watershed level to reduce flooding impacts?

Site Specific Projects

Site specific projects help improve flooding impacts at specific problem areas. Examples include:

- Flood easement acquisitions
- Improved drainage systems (catch basins, ditches and culverts that convey stormwater away from homes, developed properties and roads)
- **Discussion Question:** Based on the problem areas identified by the Advisory Committee over the course of this project, what are potential solutions to alleviate flooding at these specific locations?

Flood Response

Flood response alternatives concentrate on providing support to the community once a flood event takes place. This may include:

- Plan for sand bag distribution and disposal
- Communication protocols between the City and community residents in the event of a flood
- Emergency pumping
- **Discussion Question:** What type of support would you like to see from the City when a flood event occurs?

Multi-use Projects

Multi-use projects can add a layer of complexity to any flood reduction project, as these alternatives often require coordination between multiple entities. However, these types of projects provide community members with benefits beyond flood reduction. Examples include:

- Partnering with the Parks Department to improve open space/recreational areas
- Partnering with the Edmonds School District to provide educational opportunities
- Prioritizing projects that produce the greatest environmental benefits
- **Discussion Questions:** How would you like to see the City partner with the Parks Department and what would you like to see as a result of this partnership? With the Edmonds School District? Others? How can these ideas be incorporated into flood reduction solutions?

Evaluation Criteria Matrix

The Committee brainstormed ideas for flood reduction projects in several categories, including avoidance strategies, structural, and watershed-wide solutions. The matrix below outlines these ideas, along with the criteria suggested by the Committee (for a full list of criteria brainstormed, see next page). Some of the criteria are purely technical in nature and require more information, but others can be more accurately measured or supplemented with information and input from the community. We would like Committee members to rate the flood reduction ideas for the “community considerations” criteria as homework (see “Flood Reduction Alternatives Summary” document” to designate on a scale of **1-5** (5 being the “most positive” – e.g. most benefit) where you see each project measuring up and provide any comments you may have).

| Flood Risk Reduction Measure | Community Considerations** | Flood Reduction* | Cost* | Ease of Construction/ Implementation* | Ease of Maintenance* | Habitat Improvements* |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|-------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

**Note: these evaluation criteria are more technical in nature and we do not anticipate that Committee members will provide rankings for these criteria. However, these considerations are important elements in any decision-making process, and we expect to have a conversation about each of these criteria relative to the Committee’s alternatives and discuss any concerns or issues that Committee members may have. The City and technical consultants will act as a sounding board and will provide their expertise as the Committee discusses these criteria.*

***Under community considerations, a higher score means the alternative positively addresses most, if not all, of your considerations outlined under “community considerations” below.*

At the April Advisory Committee meeting, Committee members reviewed and generally agreed on a set of criteria. The evaluation matrix above captures these criteria as follows:

Flood reduction

- Potential to **reduce flooding** in study area
- Effects on **flooding downstream** of Scriber Lake

Community Considerations

- **Aesthetics** impacts/benefits (appearance, odors, mosquitoes, etc.)
- **Public safety** considerations
- **Land ownership**/easements
- **Partnership** opportunities
- Potential to help management of **future development**
- Effects on **property values**

Cost

- Financing/**funding** (who is paying for it – increase for rate payers?)
- **Construction costs**

Habitat improvements

- Effects on **stream and riparian habitat**
- Ability to return corridor to a more **natural flow pattern**
- Use of **native plantings**
- Reduction of **sediment transport**

Ease of construction/implementation

- **Implementation** feasibility (design and construction)
- **Permitting requirements** (Is the project readily permittable)
- **Timing** – how quickly will the project be successful?

Ease of maintenance

- **Operation and maintenance requirements** and costs
- Ease of **maintenance**
- **Permitting requirements** for maintenance work